

U.S. Department of Education
2013 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program
A Public School - 13NY15

| | Charter | Title 1 | Magnet | Choice |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| School Type (Public Schools): | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Name of Principal: Dr. David Leach Ed.D.

Official School Name: Cherry Lane Elementary School

School Mailing Address: 1 Heather Drive
Suffern, NY 10901-6613

County: Rockland State School Code Number*: 500401060001

Telephone: (845) 357-3988 E-mail: leachdj1@gmail.com

Fax: (845) 357-2191 Web site/URL: https://sites.google.com/a/ramapocentral.net/cherry-lane/

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that all information is accurate.

(Principal's Signature) Date _____

Name of Superintendent*: Dr. Douglas Adams Ed.D. Superintendent e-mail:
dadams@ramapocentral.org

District Name: Ramapo CSD District Phone: (845) 357-7783

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mr. Craig Long

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date _____

**Non-Public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Director, National Blue Ribbon Schools (Aba.Kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, National Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) or its equivalent each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's AYP requirement or its equivalent in the 2012-2013 school year. Meeting AYP or its equivalent must be certified by the state. Any AYP status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take foreign language courses.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2007 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for that period.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 or 2012.
7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT

1. Number of schools in the district 5 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
1 Middle/Junior high schools
1 High schools
0 K-12 schools
7 Total schools in district
2. District per-pupil expenditure: 25154

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Suburban
4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 6
5. Number of students as of October 1, 2012 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|---------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 29 | 37 | 66 |
| 1 | 30 | 35 | 65 |
| 2 | 32 | 39 | 71 |
| 3 | 39 | 39 | 78 |
| 4 | 41 | 38 | 79 |
| 5 | 34 | 29 | 63 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total in Applying School: | | | 422 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native
8 % Asian
6 % Black or African American
10 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
73 % White
2 % Two or more races
100 % Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2011-2012 school year: 2%
This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

| Step | Description | Value |
|------|---|-------|
| (1) | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2011 until the end of the school year. | 6 |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2011 until the end of the school year. | 3 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]. | 9 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2011 | 422 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4). | 0.02 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100. | 2 |

8. Percent of English Language Learners in the school: 3%
Total number of ELL students in the school: 11
Number of non-English languages represented: 4
Specify non-English languages:

French Creole, Spanish, Russian, Swahili

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 14%

Total number of students who qualify: 57

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services: 7%

Total number of students served: 29

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>0</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>7</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>8</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>2</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>11</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>0</u> Mental Retardation | <u>1</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

| | <u>Full-Time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Administrator(s) | <u>1</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Classroom teachers | <u>23</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Resource teachers/specialists (e.g., reading specialist, media specialist, art/music, PE teachers, etc.) | <u>16</u> | <u>4</u> |
| Paraprofessionals | <u>2</u> | <u>4</u> |
| Support staff (e.g., school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria aides, etc.) | <u>9</u> | <u>5</u> |
| Total number | <u>51</u> | <u>13</u> |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1:

18:1

13. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 96% | 96% | 95% | 96% | 96% |
| High school graduation rate | % | % | % | % | % |

14. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools):**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2012.

Graduating class size: _____

Enrolled in a 4-year college or university _____%

Enrolled in a community college _____%

Enrolled in vocational training _____%

Found employment _____%

Military service _____%

Other _____%

Total _____**0%**

15. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award:

☒ No

☐ Yes

If yes, what was the year of the award?

PART III - SUMMARY

The Ramapo Central School District (RCSD) is located in Rockland County, New York, approximately 30 miles northwest of New York City. The District serves the Villages of Airmont, Hillburn, Montebello, Tallman, Sloatsburg, Suffern, parts of Wesley Hills and Monsey – along with a small, unincorporated area of the Town of Ramapo. Kindergarten through fifth grade students attend one of the five neighborhood elementary schools. Grades six through eight are housed at a middle school, with the high school serving students in grades nine through twelve. RCSD and Cherry Lane Elementary School share the same mission—Educating for Personal Excellence—which is at the heart of who we are and what we do.

Cherry Lane Elementary School has a rich history. Since the District’s inception in 1873, many buildings have been named Cherry Lane School. The third building was a one-room schoolhouse for first through eighth grades, which stood about fifty-feet from the current building which was erected in 1964 and expanded in 2004. Current enrollment has remained steady for the past several years at approximately 430 children. Families reside primarily in the surrounding communities of Airmont, Suffern, Tallman, and part of Monsey.

Over the past decade, Cherry Lane has garnered both state and national recognition. Most noteworthy, we received the Exemplary Reading Program Award from the International Reading Association in 2004 and were named a “Reward School” by the New York State Education Department for sustained, significant progress on state assessments in 2012. These accomplishments are due, in large part, to a strong, school-wide culture that supports students and staff in achieving their fullest potential.

Cherry Lane has cultivated a school-wide ethos of high expectations for all students. Beginning in kindergarten, students are referred to as “scholars” and are taught to practice the qualities that uphold this standard. While we recognize and celebrate the unique style that each teacher possesses, a laser-like focus on student achievement is nonnegotiable. Teachers demonstrate a belief that through effort and intentional instruction, all students will succeed.

Cherry Lane is committed to developing the capacity of its human capital and sets high professional standards for its faculty and staff. Our teachers hold themselves personally accountable for student success. A strong emphasis is placed on intellectually engaging students in meaningful learning. Our teachers understand the importance of student motivation and remain focused on improving their practice.

Teacher teams have collaborative planning time built into their schedule and regularly meet to plan lessons, collaboratively score student work, and consult with instructional coaches to support their own learning. Several types of instructional coaching—literacy, mathematics, technology—are provided by teacher leaders to ensure ongoing and job-embedded professional development that is closely linked to the classroom. Faculty members regularly share best practices with one another.

Response to Intervention has supported teachers by matching instructional strategies to individual student learning goals for at-risk students. This process includes authoring very specific problem statements and goals for at-risk students, and supporting teachers with monitoring the effectiveness of their plans. While the school’s percentage of students with disabilities continues to decline, an increased emphasis has been given to accurately identifying students’ developmental opportunities and targeted, early intervention. Literacy support is provided to at-risk students before the start of the school day; targeted small-group multisensory reading instruction and math support are offered throughout the day for both classified and non-classified students.

Teachers are as excited as the students to use technology as a tool to engage in meaningful learning. Technology is integrated into all grades and courses to enhance students' learning experiences, inspire creativity and foster collaboration. Teachers and students have universal access to online resources, leading edge classroom equipment and comprehensive, building-level support for infusing technology into the curriculum. Leveraging technology extends education beyond the classroom with at-home access to teacher sites and web-based student learning resources.

The special areas complement Cherry Lane's core instructional program. All students learn Spanish beginning in first grade. Visual arts, physical education and music instruction are provided to students throughout their years at Cherry Lane and provide rich opportunities for cross-disciplinary lessons which support the core curriculum. The music program encompasses general, vocal and instrumental music. Instrumental music begins in third grade with every child playing the recorder, and continues into fourth and fifth grade with opportunities to learn band and orchestra instruments. Additionally, there are opportunities for students to be in select groups such as hand bell choir, select choir, and instrumental ensembles. Some fourth- and fifth-grade students attend the New York State School Music Association Evaluation Festivals where they are adjudicated.

Visitors to Cherry Lane often praise our children's good behavior. Students display a strong sense of school pride and demonstrate an ethic of care for younger peers. Our character education program serves to develop and reinforce children's core ethical values. Cherry Lane scholars are often "caught being good" and honored for their good deeds.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Cherry Lane Elementary School participates in the New York State Assessment Program. English language arts (ELA) and mathematics assessments are administered to students in third-, fourth-, and fifth-grades. The assessment program consists of four performance levels: Level 4: Exceeds Proficiency Standard, Level 3: Meets Proficiency Standard, Level 2: Meets Basic Standard, and Level 1: Below Standard.

Before the start of the school year, we set goals for our students' overall performance on the state assessments. This school year our ELA goal is to exceed prior year's combined proficiency level on the New York State Grades 3 – 5 ELA exams by 4% or more (79% to 83%). In mathematics, we plan to exceed the prior year's combined proficiency level on the state exams by 2% or more (90% to 92%). Although these goals may appear to be lofty in light of the New York State Education Department's recent decision to administer more rigorous assessments aligned with the Common Core Learning Standards, we believe in setting the bar high for our students.

Our teachers strive for all students to demonstrate growth on the New York State assessments. In 2012, the New York State Education Department moved to a growth model for teacher and principal evaluation. Regardless of the students' previous performance on the state exams, this approach motivates us to ensure that all of our students demonstrate growth when compared to children with similar profiles throughout New York.

In September 2012, Cherry Lane Elementary School was named a "Reward School" by the New York State Education Department (NYSED) for sustained, significant progress on state assessments. Cherry Lane is the only elementary school in Rockland County to earn this recognition. The "Reward School" designation was determined according to schools' gains in the combined ELA and Math Performance Index, average ELA and Math student growth percentiles, and demonstrated growth for students in their school's bottom quartile. According to the NYSED, on the combined ELA and Math Performance Index, Cherry Lane placed among the "highest performing/high progress schools" in New York State in terms of gains between the most recent assessment data and data from the prior year. Our average ELA and Math student growth percentiles were above average for the past two years and Cherry Lane students in the bottom quartile demonstrated above average growth.

Students' strong performance on the New York State Assessments in ELA and Math reflects our high expectations for academic achievement. Historically, our students have earned impressive scores on these exams. Since the 2007-2008 school year, an average of 80% met or exceeded proficiency in ELA. In Math, an average of 91% met or exceeded proficiency over the same five-year period. Many students have regularly exceeded expectations on both exams over the five-year period with an average of 16% in ELA and 39% in Math earning advanced ratings.

In 2010, the NYSED raised the proficiency cut scores and added rigor to the assessments to qualify for Race to the Top funding. This trend continued in 2011 and 2012. We addressed these new challenges by authoring and implementing a Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) for the first time in the 2011-2012 school year. As a school, we set an ambitious goal to increase the overall combined proficiency rate on the ELA assessments by 5%. Not only did we achieve this goal—we doubled it.

Our students have significantly outperformed New York State's reported percentage of children who met or exceeded standards by about 20% or more in ELA and 25% or more in Math. With that said, the average growth or decline in student performance in a given year has typically mirrored New York State's. This finding was not the case in 2011-2012. While children statewide showed positive

momentum in overall proficiency on the ELA and Math exams with an average increase of 2.3% of students meeting or exceeding the standard in ELA and 1.5% in Math, our students grew in 2011-2012 by 11% in ELA and 6% in Math.

In New York State, the Performance Index of each subgroup with 30 or more continuously enrolled tested students must make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). As a result, the economically disadvantaged subgroup of students are particularly noteworthy for our school. A closer review of our most recent assessment data will reveal a gap between all students and those deemed economically disadvantaged. While this subgroup continues to meet the required AYP gains, our Comprehensive School Improvement Plan includes specific interventions intended to improve their performance. We are in the midst of building our teachers' capacity for the implementation of the Common Core Learning Standards, and teaching very targeted reading comprehension and mathematics strategies to all students. Literacy and mathematics intervention services are being provided to all students in grades 1 – 5 who are not meeting grade-level expectations. Finally, all teachers have increased their emphasis on explicit and incidental vocabulary instruction. We remain confident that these interventions will continue to foster the positive student gains described above.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Student assessment analyses have been most effective when done in grade-level teams. To support teachers with data-driven instruction, they have been provided with scheduled blocks of time to analyze real-time student assessment data. The principal, instructional coaches and/or teachers set a clear purpose for the data work. The grade-level data teams focus on how specific teaching practices enhance or inhibit student progress. The grade-level teams follow a protocol to present and discuss evidence of student learning and effective teaching practices. For instance, mid-unit or upon the completion of study, it is common practice for grade-level teams to collaboratively score student work. The team rates student work according to rubric scoring levels. Student anchor papers are identified to help teachers understand and apply the standards consistently to all students. Each teacher will bring a few randomly-selected samples of student work to the meeting and interpret what the work reveals about student learning and understanding, including common trends that emerge. As grade-level teams debrief their analyses, thoughtful questions about the curriculum, teaching practices and/or assessment design often lead to follow-up improvement actions, such as the pedagogical changes needed to improve student performance.

Cherry Lane's two literacy specialists, math specialist, instructional coach and principal often use assessment results to help prepare students in literacy and mathematics. This process is ongoing, with significant time devoted before the start of the school year to identify students who benefit from academic intervention services. This team reviews multiple assessment measures to strategically assign at-risk students to flexible, small-groups with the school's appropriate specialist. As the year progresses, the team uses assessment results to provide targeted small group literacy instruction on specific reading comprehension strategies to students across the third-, fourth- and fifth-grade levels. Using the results from the Comprehensive Assessment of Reading Strategies (CARS) and Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), students are placed in small "expert" groups based on their specific literacy needs. The principal, instructional coach and two literacy specialists work along with the classroom teachers to instruct the students. This approach provides explicit small group instruction over a five week period.

The results from high-quality interim mathematics assessments are unpacked to learn about students' conceptual understanding, strategies, and ability to communicate mathematically. The mathematics specialist works with teachers to create a benchmark report which highlights students' success rate on each mathematics standard. This analysis indicates areas where our students exceed or fall below the district success rate by about five percent or more, and ranks the standards by difficulty to help guide small-group instruction. To complement this approach, attention is also given to the incorrect answer choices that students made so that specific misconceptions can be addressed, as opposed to re-teaching an entire concept.

When an educator in our building believes a child is experiencing difficulties in an academic, physical, social and/or emotional area, he/she requests to meet with the school's Instructional Support Team (IST). The IST is comprised of the reading specialist, school social worker, regular education teacher, nurse, speech therapist, occupational therapist, math specialist, special education teacher and principal. Team members collaborate and problem solve with the classroom teacher to provide the support needed for the student to reach his or her potential. The IST uses student assessment results to identify the primary problem and to monitor the effectiveness of the recommended strategies and interventions. The team reconvenes periodically to evaluate the success of the plan and make further refinements, if needed. This approach shifts the focus from asking "What's wrong with the student?" to asking "What strategies and/or interventions can we employ to ensure the student reaches his or her potential?"

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

The principal and teacher leaders from Cherry Lane Elementary have been highly successful in sharing instructional strategies and lessons at the district, state and national level.

We often share successful strategies and practices with other elementary schools in the district. For instance, an important intervention of our 2011 – 2012 Comprehensive School Improvement Plan was to author and teach integrated units aligned with the Common Core Learning Standards. While the completed units were eventually taught by teachers in the other elementary schools in the district, the most important sharing occurred during our teachers' authoring process. Teacher teams closely reviewed the curriculum maps to identify and organize important power standards and content, by trimester, that could be logically integrated. The units were designed backward from the desired student performance aligned to the rigors of the Common Core Learning Standards. This performance was often grounded in the acquisition of strong foundational literacy skills and the key content presented in the unit. While important formative assessment measures were developed in the unit, the standards were not assessed in isolation; rather, meaningful, complex performance tasks assessed a number of the power standards. The teachers selected interesting, complex literature for the content and continuously shared their work with teachers district-wide. Throughout the design and implementation of the unit, the team met to plan collaboratively. Upon the unit's conclusion, the team debriefed to share thoughts and made revisions to the unit for implementation in the next school year.

We have also shared our expertise at the state and national level—particularly in the area of instructional technology. Two teachers from Cherry Lane have developed a nationally-recognized keyboarding app, QwertyTown, which provides an environment for students to learn how to communicate online. This software is currently used by thousands of students throughout the country. Another colleague was recently selected as an inaugural member of the Sony Education Ambassador program. As part of the 11-person team, our teacher works with Sony on shaping how technology may be used in the classroom while sharing her experience through an online community for teachers around the nation. Our teachers' and principal's fulfillment of the following roles also serve as a testament to their professional leadership and commitment: Regional Director of the New York State Reading Association, County President of the New York State Music Association, Co-Presidents of the Rockland County Reading Council and Adjunct Professors at New York University, Fordham University and Long Island University.

4. Engaging Families and Communities:

Cherry Lane's school-family connection focuses on family and community *engagement* in the educational program. This approach significantly enhances the education of all children. We work closely with skilled parent and community volunteers to support the educational program. Volunteers serve in roles such as play director, guest readers and after-school program facilitators. As part of our Annual Technology Day, professionals from Sony Education, UPS, Apple, and SHARP—including many current or former Cherry Lane parents—run hands-on workshops with second-, third-, fourth- and fifth-grade students that feature cutting-edge industry technologies.

Cherry Lane has a very involved and supportive Parent Teacher Association (PTA), which funds and coordinates our interactive cultural arts programs that complement grade level curriculum. Recent examples include Author Visits, Anti-Bullying assemblies, Colonial America workshops, Hands-on Science, Chinese Dance Company, and Nutrition. The PTA's Annual Fall Festival promotes positive family-faculty partnerships. PTA representatives work closely with our school's physical education teachers to hold an annual cross country race for students, kicked-off the night before with a school-wide family spaghetti dinner.

Parent volunteers work closely with our Family Resource Center (FRC) to further support our families. Afterschool Student Development Programs include chess club, Mad Science, golf, yoga and drama. The FRC also supports and engages families through monthly Family Fun Nights and Crafts Childcare activities which are held during parent conferences, as well as workshops to address topics such as Common Sense Parenting and Cyberbullying.

Through its FRC, Cherry Lane offers over 25 pre-school clubs (ages 2 - 5) throughout the year to promote early literacy development. For school-age children, the school's literacy specialists, teachers and FRC Coordinator work together to facilitate evening child/parent book study groups to promote literacy at home. Nonfiction literature supporting the curriculum has been used to share reading and writing strategies with parents and their children.

Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) at Cherry Lane thrive beyond our brick and mortar. Students and teachers have a wide array of web-based software programs that are accessible inside and outside of school. Every teacher and staff member has their own website which they maintain and update throughout the year. Teachers encourage students and their families to use their website as an online resource for content-specific educational websites, assignments, class documents and happenings, and to view student-created digital projects. In an effort to centralize important school information and reduce paper costs, Cherry Lane instituted a Digital Backpack. Each week, paper notices that previously would have gone home with students are now posted electronically to the school's Digital Backpack page which can be accessed on our school's website (<https://sites.google.com/a/ramapocentral.net/cherry-lane/backpack>).

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Our Comprehensive School Improvement Plan for 2012-2013 focuses on building capacity for the Common Core Learning Standards. For the past few years we have authored or adopted coherent, content-rich integrated units of study driven by high-quality reading, writing and discussion in every subject. Classroom and special area teachers have worked along with specialists to craft or adopt common interim assessments, analyze student performance and improve teaching as the units are taught. The units rely upon complex texts and encourage higher level questioning. Students have many opportunities to use close reading strategies, discuss and write about the texts as they support their written arguments with evidence. To meet this challenge, the school employs a model in which academic support staff collaborate with grade-level and subject area teachers to develop differentiated instruction targeted to the range of student needs within each classroom. Interventions and enrichment opportunities are designed within the core curriculum so that students regularly work at their instructional level. Curriculum maps define units of study that anchor the instructional program. Professional staff use the content, skills and recommended resources defined in these documents in their planning. Unit-specific assessments, as well as state and local measures, are incorporated into a balanced assessment plan that enables teachers to monitor student progress. Curriculum maps are revised regularly based on federal and state mandates as well as faculty reflections. The goal is to maximize achievement within the context of preparing each student for college and career success.

The elementary program, encompassing literacy, mathematics, science, social studies, Spanish, physical education, art and music, focuses on teaching students how to learn. Children engage in cross-disciplinary learning experiences that foster curiosity, critical thinking, experimentation, reflection and promote a service ethic.

The goals of the District's balanced literacy approach are to inspire students to read, develop their passion for writing and increase their ability to be attentive listeners and skilled communicators. A strong emphasis placed on developing each child's literacy skills within a workshop model maximizes the benefits of differentiated small group instruction. Integrated units of study afford students rich opportunities to apply their literacy skills across disciplines.

A constructivist approach to learning mathematics enables students to make meaning of numbers, shapes and data. A spiraling curriculum ensures strong conceptual development that anchors advancement of skills. Applications of numeracy concepts and skills are embedded within STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) units. These hands-on, minds-on experiences provide an authentic context for collaborative problem-solving and innovation.

Through the Foreign Language in the Elementary Schools (FLES) program, students begin learning Spanish in first grade. FLES incorporates grade-level social studies, math and science content into Spanish lessons to reinforce the core curriculum while developing language proficiency. Exploratory units in Italian, French and Chinese afford opportunities to learn about additional world languages that students may elect to study in the secondary schools.

The special area subjects of visual arts, general music, and physical education are strongly emphasized to provide a well-rounded education. These subjects make authentic interdisciplinary connections with the core curricula while preserving their important content, skills and concepts.

School-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) approach promotes good citizenship, emphasizing values such as respect for others, fairness, truthfulness and cooperation. The school-wide

approach to character education is reinforced in classrooms so that students benefit from a consistent message regarding expectations.

Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) are synonymous with instruction and learning at Cherry Lane. The faculty values the importance of ICTs as a resource to enhance instruction and digital literacy as a vital component for student achievement at every grade level. Teachers focus on the importance of digital literacy and how it reflects the need for students to develop learning skills that enable them to think critically, analyze information, communicate, collaborate and problem-solve, and the essential role it plays in realizing these learning skills in today's knowledge-based society. Digital literacy skills are embedded throughout our curriculum and far exceed the expectations of digital literacy as defined by the Common Core Learning Standards. To ensure proficiency with ICTs, our teachers and students regularly use web-based applications such as Google Drive, Google Sites, Learning.com and QwertyTown to research, collaborate and advance digital literacy across the curriculum.

2. Reading/English:

Cherry Lane provides a comprehensive, balanced approach to teaching reading. All teachers in the school provide guided reading instruction to attend to each child's growth in the following areas: phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Teachers differentiate reading instruction by forming leveled, fluid reading groups. They select fiction and nonfiction literature that is closely aligned to the student's zone of proximal development. At the start of the school year, teachers assess children's reading levels using the Developmental Reading Assessment, 2nd Edition (DRA2). Throughout the academic year, they closely monitor each student's reading development through the administration of the DRA Progress monitoring tools and running records. Significant professional development has prepared teachers to effectively facilitate small, homogenous reading groups while the rest of the class focuses on rich literacy tasks without direct support. Additionally, professional development has been provided to ensure rater-reliability on the DRA2 and related Progress Monitoring Assessments, and to support teachers use of the instruments to guide instructional planning.

Teachers also rely on whole-class and small group read-alouds of non-leveled literature. Non-leveled literature is used as a resource in the readers' workshop model when a whole group mini-lesson is presented. Given the demands of the Common Core Learning Standards, teachers now more frequently engage students in the close reading of complex, non-leveled text, often above students' independent reading levels. This approach has encouraged teachers to offer text-dependent questions, limited frontloading of information and more reading aloud by the teacher.

Regardless of the instructional method, teachers regularly confer with students and encourage them to engage in self-selected independent reading of quality literature. The use of mentor texts during writers' workshop has served students well in the development of their writing.

Cherry Lane's approach to Response to Intervention accounts for the ages and stages of children's literacy development, providing targeted intervention services to students not meeting reading expectations. Students use an instructional software program called Lexia Reading to support the acquisition of phonemic awareness, phonics and fluency. Real-time assessment results of student progress guide instruction. Students also access this tool from home. At-risk students are also provided with additional, explicit reading instruction before the start of the instructional day from a reading specialist, in a class called Sunrise Scholars. For students who present as needing intensive, multisensory reading instruction, a full-time faculty member dedicated to using the Orton Gillingham methodology instructs very small groups of students across the grade levels. Finally, a collaborative co-teaching model provides literacy instruction to students with- and without educationally handicapping conditions in the regular classroom. The expectation remains that all students will meet or exceed the Common Core Literacy Learning Standards.

3. Mathematics:

Cherry Lane teachers use the second edition of the *Investigations in Number, Data and Space* program as the chief core curriculum resource. This National Science Foundation-endorsed program promotes mathematical reasoning and understanding, while emphasizing the importance of learning math facts and mastering traditional computation.

The heart of our mathematics curriculum is problem-solving. Through rich tasks, students use manipulatives to build and explore ideas. They learn and share multiple strategies to solve problems. This approach serves them well when they are confronted with non-routine problems to solve.

Differentiating mathematics instruction is common practice at Cherry Lane and occurs primarily during the regular classroom lesson for the entire range of learners. Variations of math games and levels of play are available to the students. The curriculum provides leveled practice and differentiated support for class activities.

Each unit has benchmarks, including skills and concepts, to be mastered. Embedded, authentic and on-line assessments are available to help guide instruction. End of unit performance tasks with multi-step problems are given to students to assess progress toward the relevant benchmarks.

The school's mathematics specialist provides small group instruction with both pull-out and push-in methods, to support students who are not meeting grade-level expectations. To assess how well students have learned the math curriculum, common assessments are given to students several times a year. Classroom teachers work collaboratively with the math specialist to analyze, re-teach and refine their unit or lesson, often examining the students work to identify any common misconceptions.

Prior to a unit of study, teachers work diligently to unpack and familiarize themselves with the Common Core Learning Standards for Mathematics, including aligning resources and tools to the units and identifying common misconceptions that students may encounter. This work generally takes place during teachers' collaborative planning meetings. Instructional technology serves as an important tool to support this work. Students in grades two through five use Math Reflex, a research-based educational software program, to support fact fluency. Students also access this software at home and teachers are provided with real-time assessment results. Similarly, the teachers in all grade-levels use IXL.com, a research based software to supplement instruction, provide reinforcement and pre- and post-assess mathematics concepts taught.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Applications of numeracy concepts and skills are embedded within Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) units beginning in first grade. These hands-on, minds-on experiences provide an authentic context for collaborative problem solving and innovation. The *Engineering is Elementary* (EiE) curricular units are taught in the grade levels as the corresponding science concept is covered. In each unit, students are introduced to the engineering problem through literature. Students work in cooperative groups to solve a hands-on engineering design challenge with the aid of the engineering design process (i.e., ask, imagine, plan, create, and improve). For example, in a fourth-grade unit called What Works? Electricity and Magnetism, students design and build inventions that use magnetism and/or electricity to solve an everyday problem. Then, they create print advertisements and video commercials to promote the inventions, research appropriate manufacturers and pitch their inventions. Students complete both a written and performance task summative exam.

The school district was one of the first in the country to implement *Creative Computing; A Design-Based Introduction to Computational Thinking*, a computational thinking unit published by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Media Lab's Lifelong Kindergarten Group. Third-grade students use Scratch, a simple programming language, to learn that computational thinkers think creatively, reason

systematically, solve problems, work collaboratively, and persist through obstacles. These skills are honed in an authentic, project-based learning environment. As students create their own programs in Scratch, they learn core computational concepts (e.g., iteration and conditionals) and mathematical concepts (e.g., coordinates and variables) that they can immediately apply in a meaningful way. Following the Engineering Design Process, students start with an idea for an animation or game, create a prototype, test the prototype, debug it as needed, get feedback from classmates, then revise and redesign it. Building in Scratch also develops students' fluency in digital technology by enhancing their ability to express themselves with a programming language. Collaboration is an essential component of the unit; students become more adept programmers by learning from each other, sharing code and exchanging constructive feedback. Some of the school's students and teachers visited MIT as keynote speakers at a Scratch Conference in July, 2012.

Fifth-graders end the school year with an integrated STEM unit called Considering Perspectives: Social Responsibility, which challenges them to see themselves as global citizens who can have a positive impact on issues in the world. Students learn how socio-environmental factors impact living organisms. Students research current socio-environmental issues in the Western Hemisphere and choose an issue to investigate further. Ultimately, they must design and present a solution that will influence positive action for change.

5. Instructional Methods:

Faculty and staff work diligently to maximize differentiation of instruction to meet the diverse needs of all student subgroups. The universal design of lessons often calls for the "whole-small-whole" teaching model. Upon the completion of a whole group mini-lesson, students often work in small groups or confer with an adult or peer to receive individual attention. Homogeneous and heterogeneous groupings are regularly employed, dependent upon the desired learning outcome.

Cherry Lane's Resource Team further supports differentiation of instruction. Comprised of the school's instructional facilitator, instructional technology facilitator, library media specialist and principal, the team's primary role is to collaborate with teachers on planning and implementing instruction that intellectually engages students in their guaranteed curriculum. This modeling and support is a means of teacher professional development; the expectation is that the classroom teacher will independently sustain the differentiated instruction and best educational practices moving forward.

To support grade-level teams with this instructional planning, the Resource Team regularly meets with teachers during their collaborative planning sessions. The unit design is reviewed, specific student needs are identified and related resources are considered. Particular emphasis is given to honing students' 21st century skills and digital literacy. Close attention is given to the unit's desired results, assessment evidence and learning plan to ensure a rigorous learning experience for all students.

Teachers and students require the Resource Team's support to ensure fidelity of the implementation of the new unit. Typically, instruction is delivered in both the classroom and media center, with a heavy reliance on small group instruction. The "whole-small-whole" model and Resource Team support help to promote significant, student-directed learning. The scope and intensity of the team's involvement shifts each year according to the needs of students and teachers. Currently, the team's focus is the support of new, Common Core-aligned literacy modules in third-, fourth-and fifth-grades.

Teachers consult with the reading specialists, the math specialist, special educators and the school's Instructional Support Team to remain cognizant of each student's individual needs and specific learning profile. To ensure that students receive as much individual attention as possible, instructional aides and teaching assistants have been trained to provide additional literacy support to students in small-group settings.

Cherry Lane promotes 21st century bilinguality: all students are proficient on both Mac and PC platforms. Our school is equipped with a technology lab (PC), a library and research lab (Mac) and a media lab (Mac). Each classroom has at least four PC desktop computers and an interactive whiteboard. With the installation of Wi-Fi in the building two years ago, we've begun transitioning to more mobile solutions.

6. Professional Development:

The professional development plan at Cherry Lane Elementary School is targeted to meet the goals delineated in our Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP). To guide our professional development plan we seek to answer the question, "What do the performance results of our students tell us about our teachers' learning needs?" This practice promotes a professional culture that emphasizes lifelong learning for teachers and school-based staff. We believe that targeted, rigorous professional development provides teachers with valuable opportunities to expand their expertise with the ultimate goal of boosting student achievement. While the school has certainly benefited from the consultation of external consultants, professional development has been most effective when it relies upon the expertise of our own teachers. Not only is this a more cost-effective approach, but it also promotes ongoing, sustainable professional development at the school. Ultimately, the efficacy of our approach is evaluated when we determine whether our CSIP goals were obtained.

A very successful and ongoing school-based professional development effort/component is the practice of grade-level teams and teacher leaders analyzing common interim assessment results and student work. Our teachers use this information to seek pedagogical strategies and engage in quality instructional planning to help them meet their students' needs. This approach recently helped guide our decision to deliver professional development to further teachers' understanding of quality incidental and direct vocabulary instruction.

In addition to using student results to guide our professional development plan, the principal formally observes and evaluates all teachers annually to provide evidence-based feedback. This approach guides the professional development goals that are collaboratively set for individual teachers and the faculty at large. For instance, the principal set a goal to enhance teachers' literacy assessment practices and rater reliability across the building. Teachers worked in teams to standardize the administration protocols of the DRA2 and the companion Progress Monitoring Assessment. Teachers listened to students' taped responses and agreed upon specific instructional levels. This adult learning led to more accurate student assessment results.

7. School Leadership:

Visions best take hold when they are shared – and our principal creates them by listening to stakeholders, appreciating their opinions and attending to their needs. This shared vision for learning emphasizes student achievement. Specifically, the principal engages stakeholders throughout the year in the development of the school's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan to promote continuous and sustainable growth. The principal collaborates with teachers to monitor and refine this plan and engages parents in this discussion.

The principal promotes specific, research-based disciplines to emphasize a strong focus on academic achievement. Teachers are empowered to make informed curriculum choices to ensure the most important literacy and mathematics standards are addressed. This process includes taking the time to make mid-course corrections to our academic program when our students' results indicate the need to do so. All faculty and staff are encouraged to make the most of every instructional minute. To support the children, the value of every staff member is emphasized with the faculty. This practice ensures that regardless of an individual's title, we all support our students' acquisition of the core skills of reading, writing and mathematics.

While our principal is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction and assessment practices, the leadership at Cherry Lane Elementary School is especially enhanced through the successful use of distributive leadership. The principal delegates and spreads key leadership functions widely throughout the school so that team synergy—the notion that the group outperforms its best individual—is accomplished. Teacher leaders play an integral role in this success. The school's instructional coach, literacy specialists, math specialist and school psychologist work closely with the principal to identify areas in need of improvement and colleagues in need of support. Each teacher leader keeps the principal informed of the specific pedagogical content knowledge in their respective content areas. Formal structures are in place to allow this group of teacher leaders to lead professional development, consult with classroom teachers and to model best teaching practices. The master schedule is written to accommodate this work, most often occurring during collaborative planning sessions, classroom lessons, and faculty meetings. The principal is a strong proponent of handling routine announcements via e-mail and using faculty and grade-level collaborative meetings to analyze student work, to provide ongoing professional development and to engage in instructional planning. The principal mentors this group and encourages them to build trusting relationships with the broader faculty. This approach is necessary to effectively support optimal/best teaching practices.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: NY State Testing Program

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: Pearson

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | May | May | Mar | Mar |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 78 | 87 | 82 | 100 | 99 |
| Level 4 | 10 | 26 | 56 | 33 | 27 |
| Number of students tested | 80 | 62 | 77 | 83 | 79 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 50 | Masked | 73 | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | 7 | Masked | 36 | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 3 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 9 | | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 4 | 3 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | | | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | | | 5 | 8 | 3 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | | Masked | | |
| Level 4 | Masked | | Masked | | |
| Number of students tested | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 6. Asian | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 5 |
| NOTES: | | | | | |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. | | | | | |
| Per NYSED guidelines, if a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. On July 28, 2010, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) shared its decision to raise cut scores on the 2010 English language arts and math assessments to reflect the New College-Ready Proficiency Standards. As a result, student scores decreased statewide by 24% in English language arts 25% in mathematics. On August 8, 2011, the NYSED reported that the average scale scores on the English exams were slightly lower than prior year at all grade levels; the average scale scores in math were about the same. The Department also made changes to the exams to make | | | | | |

them more comprehensive and better measures of student skill development. On July 17, 2012, NYSED announced that the average scale scores in both ELA and math were slightly higher than last year in most grades, reporting a small increase in the percentage of grades 3-8 students across the State who met or exceeded the proficiency standard on both exams. Source: <http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/> Test Publishers: 2008, CTB McGraw-Hill; 2009: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2010:CTB McGraw-Hill; 2011: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2012: Pearson

13NY15

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: NY State Testing Program

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: Pearson

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | May | Apr | Jan | Jan |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 78 | 71 | 75 | 88 | 89 |
| Level 4 | 10 | 6 | 18 | 22 | 14 |
| Number of students tested | 80 | 62 | 77 | 83 | 79 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 50 | Masked | 73 | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | 7 | Masked | 9 | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 3 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 3 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | 0 | Masked | | |
| Level 4 | Masked | 0 | Masked | | |
| Number of students tested | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 6. Asian | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 5 |
| NOTES: Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. Per NYSED guidelines, if a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. On July 28, 2010, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) shared its decision to raise cut scores on the 2010 English language arts and math assessments to reflect the New College-Ready Proficiency Standards. As a result, student scores decreased statewide by 24% in English language arts 25% in mathematics. On August 8, 2011, the NYSED reported that the average scale scores on the English exams were slightly lower than prior year at all grade levels; the average scale scores in math were about the same. The Department also made changes to the exams to make them more comprehensive and better measures of student skill development. On July 17, 2012, NYSED announced that the | | | | | |

average scale scores in both ELA and math were slightly higher than last year in most grades, reporting a small increase in the percentage of grades 3-8 students across the State who met or exceeded the proficiency standard on both exams Source: <http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/> Test Publishers: 2008, CTB McGraw-Hill; 2009: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2010: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2011: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2012: Pearson

13NY15

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: NYS Testing Program

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: Pearson

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | May | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 92 | 85 | 79 | 100 | 97 |
| Level 4 | 46 | 50 | 36 | 41 | 38 |
| Number of students tested | 63 | 80 | 87 | 75 | 79 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | 100 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | 50 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | 30 | Masked | Masked | 90 |
| Level 4 | Masked | 20 | Masked | Masked | 10 |
| Number of students tested | 7 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 10 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Masked |
| Level 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Masked |
| Number of students tested | | | | | 5 |
| 6. Asian | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | 100 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | 80 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 7 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| NOTES: | | | | | |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. | | | | | |
| Per NYSED guidelines, if a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. On July 28, 2010, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) shared its decision to raise cut scores on the 2010 English language arts and math assessments to reflect the New College-Ready Proficiency Standards. As a result, student scores decreased statewide by 24% in English language arts 25% in mathematics. On August 8, 2011, the NYSED reported that the average scale scores on the English exams were slightly lower than prior year at all grade levels; the average scale scores in math were about the same. The Department also made changes to the exams to make them more comprehensive and better measures of student skill development. On July 17, 2012, NYSED announced that the | | | | | |

average scale scores in both ELA and math were slightly higher than last year in most grades, reporting a small increase in the percentage of grades 3-8 students across the State who met or exceeded the proficiency standard on both exams. Source: <http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/> Test Publishers: 2008, CTB McGraw-Hill; 2009: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2010:CTB McGraw-Hill; 2011: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2012: Pearson

13NY15

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: NYS Testing Program

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: Pearson

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | May | Apr | Jan | Jan |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 84 | 67 | 70 | 93 | 82 |
| Level 4 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 63 | 79 | 87 | 75 | 79 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | 62 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | 8 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 13 | 8 | 4 | 3 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | 80 | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | 0 | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 3 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | 80 | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | 0 | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 7 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 5 |
| NOTES: Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. Per NYSED guidelines, if a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. On July 28, 2010, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) shared its decision to raise cut scores on the 2010 English language arts and math assessments to reflect the New College-Ready Proficiency Standards. As a result, student scores decreased statewide by 24% in English language arts 25% in mathematics. On August 8, 2011, the NYSED reported that the average scale scores on the English exams were slightly lower than prior year at all grade levels; the average scale scores in math were about the same. The Department also made changes to the exams to make them more comprehensive and better measures of student skill development. On July 17, 2012, NYSED announced that the | | | | | |

average scale scores in both ELA and math were slightly higher than last year in most grades, reporting a small increase in the percentage of grades 3-8 students across the State who met or exceeded the proficiency standard on both exams Source: <http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/> Test Publishers: 2008, CTB McGraw-Hill; 2009: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2010: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2011: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2012: Pearson

13NY15

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: NYS Testing Program

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: Pearson

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | May | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 96 | 82 | 91 | 99 | 94 |
| Level 4 | 51 | 43 | 39 | 66 | 23 |
| Number of students tested | 77 | 88 | 79 | 80 | 66 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 92 | 100 | Masked | Masked | 73 |
| Level 4 | 51 | 50 | Masked | Masked | |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 11 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | 100 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | 80 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | 30 | Masked | 92 | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | 20 | Masked | 15 | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 8 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | | | | 4 | 2 |
| 6. Asian | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 100 | 100 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | 50 | 80 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| NOTES: | | | | | |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. | | | | | |
| Per NYSED guidelines, if a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. On July 28, 2010, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) shared its decision to raise cut scores on the 2010 English language arts and math assessments to reflect the New College-Ready Proficiency Standards. As a result, student scores decreased statewide by 24% in English language arts 25% in mathematics. On August 8, 2011, the NYSED reported that the average scale scores on the English exams were slightly lower than prior year at all grade levels; the average scale scores in math were about the same. The Department also made changes to the exams to make them more comprehensive and better measures of student skill development. On July 17, 2012, NYSED announced that the | | | | | |

average scale scores in both ELA and math were slightly higher than last year in most grades, reporting a small increase in the percentage of grades 3-8 students across the State who met or exceeded the proficiency standard on both exams. Source: <http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/> Test Publishers: 2008, CTB McGraw-Hill; 2009: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2010:CTB McGraw-Hill; 2011: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2012: Pearson

13NY15

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: NYS Testing Program

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: Pearson

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | May | Apr | Jan | Jan |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 77 | 66 | 75 | 98 | 87 |
| Level 4 | 8 | 5 | 24 | 23 | 6 |
| Number of students tested | 77 | 88 | 79 | 81 | 67 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 58 | 60 | Masked | Masked | 50 |
| Level 4 | 0 | 0 | Masked | Masked | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 12 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | Masked | 0 | Masked | 92 | Masked |
| Level 4 | Masked | 0 | Masked | 0 | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 8 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | | | | 4 | 2 |
| 6. Asian | | | | | |
| Level 3 and 4 | 80 | 80 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Level 4 | 0 | 10 | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| NOTES: | | | | | |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. | | | | | |
| Per NYSED guidelines, if a group has fewer than five students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. On July 28, 2010, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) shared its decision to raise cut scores on the 2010 English language arts and math assessments to reflect the New College-Ready Proficiency Standards. As a result, student scores decreased statewide by 24% in English language arts 25% in mathematics. On August 8, 2011, the NYSED reported that the average scale scores on the English exams were slightly lower than prior year at all grade levels; the average scale scores in math were about the same. The Department also made changes to the exams to make them more comprehensive and better measures of student skill development. On July 17, 2012, NYSED announced that the | | | | | |

average scale scores in both ELA and math were slightly higher than last year in most grades, reporting a small increase in the percentage of grades 3-8 students across the State who met or exceeded the proficiency standard on both exams Source: <http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/> Test Publishers: 2008, CTB McGraw-Hill; 2009: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2010: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2011: CTB McGraw-Hill; 2012: Pearson

13NY15